From: Mathieus, George
To: Tina Laidlaw/MO/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: FW: Nutrient Variances
Date: 06/11/2012 09:42 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Mumford, David [mailto:MumfordD@ci.billings.mt.us]
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2012 9:47 AM
To: Mathieus, George
Cc: McInnis, Amanda
Subject: RE: Nutrient Variances

Good morning George

Thank you for the work you put in that is obvious in your response to our last meeting. This is a great step in trying to find ways to address the MLCT concerns within the existing rules. Do you think we could meet next week to continue discussing? I would propose either Wednesday afternoon at 2:30 or early Thursday morning say 8:30 or 9:00. We do have a couple questions on the proposed information we would like to discuss at the next meeting.

3-Year Review Questions
--Is this like the economic review that included Reverse Osmosis?
--Does MDEQ look at N and P separately in this? Or together?
--Would this start and 10 and 1 and then look at going lower?
--What's the benchmark for affordability?

Questions Under "Yes, Unless: 1)"
-- It's too costly--is this 1% MHI or is this EPA's definition?
"will take facility to the limits of technology without achieving the standard beyond the mixing zone"
--We would like to discuss how this is defined--will the standard only be applied if there were nuisance algae present or if there were another indicator affected, not just on the basis of N and P alone (like the Maine approach).

Questions Under "Yes, Unless: 2)"
--If I understand this right, then Jenny doesn't apply the standard directly in the permit, but rather the standard is used in developing the TMDL and the wasteload allocation (like the Clark Fork). I'd like to make sure we understand what this section is saying.
--Clarification on how within the TMDL, DEQ would decide whether a discharger is an insignificant source. One approach is to use algae production changes. Would it be acceptable for N and P treated separately in this analysis. If a discharger is an insignificant source of either nutrient, what happens then? Do they get a maintain current performance allocation? Or 10 and 1?

Questions Under "Yes, Unless: 3)"
--We would like clarification on the definition of significant environmental improvement and progress toward the standard.

Thanks again for the listening to our concerns and coming up with a great step to resolving them.

Dave

-- -----Original Message-----
From: Mathieus, George [mailto:gemathieus@mt.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 05, 2012 5:18 PM
To: Mumford, David
Cc: McInnis, Amanda
Subject: Nutrient Variances

I apologize if some of this is babble, I am out of time and have spent the last 3 days working 12-14 hours at my duplex and I have to get ov....I fly out to Denver at 6:30 am tomorrow.....feel free to call my cell[Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy].

Thanks, George